UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,774	05/25/2007	Craig Heath	356952.00052-US	1329
	7590 11/13/200 P (Philadelphia)	EXAMINER		
Attn: Patent Do	cket Clerk	SQUIRES, BRETT S		
2 North Second St. Harrisburg, PA 17101			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
<u> </u>			2431	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/13/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/596,774	HEATH ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	BRETT SQUIRES	2431			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 Ma	av 2007.				
· <u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 26 June 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/23/06. 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/596,774 Page 2

Art Unit: 2431

Abstract

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract, excluding indefinite articles, is only thirty nine words in length. The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph within the range of 50 to 150 words.

See MPEP § 608.01(b). Appropriate correction is required.

Specification

- 2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the various sections of the specification are not labeled with the appropriate section heading.

 Please see MPEP 608.01(a). Appropriate correction is required.
- 3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the definition set forth by the applicant of the claim term "computing device," is repugnant to its ordinary and customary meanings. The applicant defines "computing device," on page 1 lines 11-12 of the specification "The term computing device as used herein is to be expansively construed to cover any form of electrical device." This definition includes passive electrical devices such as transformers and therefore is repugnant to the ordinary and customary meanings of computing device. Appropriate correction is required.

Application/Control Number: 10/596,774 Page 3

Art Unit: 2431

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 1-5 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Olkin et al. (US 2003/0074552).

Regarding Claims 1 and 11:

Olkin discloses a method of operating a computing device ("Personal Computer" See fig. 1 ref. nos. 18, 20 and paragraph 42), the method comprising, in response to a request from a user to carry out an operation using the device ("Application Session" See paragraph 67), determining the time period since the identity of the user was authenticated ("The cache time setting works with the cache password setting to control the maximum time which a password can be cached." See paragraph 68), and enabling the requested operation in dependence upon the determined time period and the purpose of the requested operation ("The configuration options generally should persist from session to session, consistent with good security practice they should be associated with a user and not merely a machine." See paragraph 64).

Regarding Claim 2:

Olkin discloses the identity of the user is authenticated using a pass phrase ("The major security element is making conversation keys available to any user who has

authenticated by any means sufficient to the key server. This could be a simple password, digital certificates, biometric, etc." See paragraph 222).

Regarding Claim 3:

Olkin discloses the identity of the user is authenticated using biometric information ("The major security element is making conversation keys available to any user who has authenticated by any means sufficient to the key server. This could be a simple password, digital certificates, biometric, etc." See paragraph 222).

Regarding Claim 4:

Olkin discloses determining the time period since the identity of the user was last authenticated ("The cache time setting works with the cache password setting to control the maximum time which a password can be cached." See paragraph 68).

Regarding Claim 5:

Olkin discloses the request operation is enabled if the determined time period is less than or equal to a time period set by the user ("Suitable defaults can be provided in most, if not situation, but sophisticated users or particular situations may merit changing these settings." and "Particular examples of settings in the configuration options may include: an encrypt subject setting, a cache password setting, a cache time setting, an expiration setting, a maximum reads setting, and others" See paragraphs 64-65).

Regarding Claims 9 and 10:

Olkin discloses the computing device is a mobile phone ("Cell-Phone" See paragraph 43).

Art Unit: 2431

6. Claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kondo et al. (US 2003/0191594).

Regarding Claims 1 and 11:

Kondo discloses a method of operating a computing device ("Personal Computer" See paragraph 7), the method comprising, in response to a request from a user to carry out an operation using the device ("The processing sequence performs the authentication processing every time the user operation is performed." See fig. 2 and paragraph 7), determining the time period since the identity of the user was authenticated ("The time period is set such that the time period begins when the user is authenticated and expires immediately after one user operation is performed." See paragraph 8), and enabling the requested operation in dependence upon the determined time period and the purpose of the requested operation ("When the authentication is successful once, only one operation immediately after the authentication is permitted." See paragraph 8).

Regarding Claim 2:

Kondo discloses the identity of the user is authenticated using a pass phrase ("When the checking processing determines that the password input from the user agrees with the password stored in the storage unit, it is determined that the authentication is successful." See paragraphs 4 and 7).

Regarding Claims 5 and 7:

Kondo discloses the time period for a type of operation is arranged to expire upon completion of the immediately preceding operation of the same type ("When the

authentication is successful once, only one operation immediately after the authentication is permitted. Accordingly, the time period for all other operations will expire immediately upon completion of the one operation." See paragraph 8)

Regarding Claim 8:

Kondo discloses categories of operation used to determine the purpose for a request operation are set by the user ("The user operation is diverse, ranging from, for example, obtaining data from storage means in a PC having the authentication unit, updating, drawing money from the financial terminal, and downloading data from the server through the network." See paragraph 5)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Kondo et al. (US 2003/0191594) in view of Olkin et al. (US 2003/0074552).

Kondo discloses the above stated user authentication method where the authentication processing and operation permission are repetitively performed every time an operation from a diverse range of user operations, such as obtaining data from storage means in a PC having the authentication unit, updating data, drawing money

from the financial terminal, and downloading data from the server through the network, is performed (See paragraph 8)

Kondo does not discloses the time period set for one time of operation is a multiple of a time period set for another type of operation.

Olkin discloses user configurable cache password word settings and password cache time for an e-mail operation (See paragraphs 41 and 64-68).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the user authentication method of Kondo to include user configurable password settings and password cache time for user operations such as that taught by Olkin in order to improve processing efficiency of the user authentication method (See Kondo paragraph 8).

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRETT SQUIRES whose telephone number is (571) 272-8021. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30am - 6:00pm Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/596,774 Page 8

Art Unit: 2431

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BS/

/Christopher A. Revak/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431